



**KILPATRICK
STOCKTON LLP**

Attorneys at Law

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 13 2007

Suite 900 607 14th St., NW
Washington DC 20005-2018
t 202 508 5800 f 202 508 5858
www.KilpatrickStockton.com

August 13, 2007

direct dial 202 508 5889
direct fax 202 585 0005
DBey@KilpatrickStockton.com

FAX

RECIPIENT/ PHONE NO.	FAX NO.	COMPANY/ CITY, STATE, COUNTRY
Examiner M. Angebrannt Group Art Unit: 1756	PTO Central Fax 571 273 8300	USPTO

Comments -- for filing:

Reply Brief (! pages)

Applicant(s): Richard L. SUTHERLAND, et al
Title: A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR REPLICATING VOLUME
HOLOGRAMS
Serial No.: 10/796,071
Filing Date: March 10, 2004
Docket No.: SAIC0006-CON1
Due: 08/14/2007

Dawn-Marie Bey

FROM

3

PAGES (WITH COVER)

8889

REFERENCE NO

36609/297074

CLIENT/MATTER NO.

PLEASE CALL 202 508 5816 IF YOU HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH THIS TRANSMISSION.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

The information contained in this fax message is being transmitted to and is intended for the use of the individual named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby advised that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this fax is strictly prohibited. If you have received this fax in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and destroy this fax message.

TO BE COMPLETED BY KS OPERATIONS CENTER

TRANSMISSION RECEIPT DATE/TIME: _____

COMPLETED BY: _____

JOB CODE: _____

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

US2000 9501401.1

ATLANTA AUGUSTA CHARLOTTE LONDON NEW YORK RALEIGH STOCKHOLM WASHINGTON WINSTON-SALEM

SAIC0006-C00N1
Serial No. 10/796,071

1

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

In re Patent Application of

AUG 13 2007

Richard L. Suther and, et al.

Art Unit: 1756

Serial No. 10/796,071

Examiner: ANGEBRANNDT, M.

Filed: March 10, 2004

For: A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR REPLICATING VOLUME HOLOGRAMS

REPLY BRIEF

FILED BY FACSIMILE - 571-273-8300

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief filed in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.41 and in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed June 22, 2007.

The undersigned responds to the arguments beginning on page 15 of the Examiner's Answer under the section **(10) Response to Argument** as all previous pages contain duplicative rejections and arguments. In response to **(10)A**: The Office admits that "none of the references cited teaches using an electrically switchable hologram as a master in a contact duplication process," stating, "[t]he examiner agrees and addresses these criteria in a point by point basis." Accordingly, there is admittedly a limitation missing from the cited references, and as such the Office has not established a *prima face* case of unpatentability under 35 USC §103.

The remaining arguments by the Office are both moot in view of the admission above and repetitive and have been addressed numerous times by the undersigned. As stated by the Office the arguments "will not be repeated needlessly."

US2000 10224182.1

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SAIC0006-CON1
Serial No. 10/796,071

2

PATENT

Simply stated, the Office argues using a combination of 5 references (that do not even cover the claimed limitations as shown above) that it would be obvious to start with a primary reference that describes a dual beam, non-contact copying method to form a static hologram having static, varying, areas of diffraction efficiency and end up with a single beam contact copying process that uses an electrically controllable variable diffraction efficiency master hologram to form a replica hologram also having an electrically controllable variable diffraction efficiency. The Office focuses much attention on the technical teachings of the individual references and offers numerous personal and conclusory opinions, but ultimately, (1) there is no reference that teaches using an electrically switchable hologram as a master to form any type of hologram, static or otherwise through contact copying and (2) the motivation to combine the individual teachings is simply not shown.

The undersigned respectfully maintains that claims 49-90 are allowable over this combination of references since the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability. In view of the remarks stated above, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Board request that the rejections of claims 49-90 be withdrawn and a notice of allowance extended.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/13/07
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
Suite 900
607 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 508-5889

By: /Dawn-Marie Bey Reg. No. 44,442/
Dawn-Marie Bey
Registration No. 44,442

10224182v.1US2006/DMB/36609.297074

US2000 10224182.1